Correlation evolution and monogamy of two geometric quantum discords in multipartite systems

Yan-Kui Bai[1,2],* Ting-Ting Zhang[2], Li-Tao Wang[2], and Z. D. Wang[1†]
[1] *Department of Physics and Center of Theoretical and Computational Physics, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China*
[2] *College of Physical Science and Information Engineering and Hebei Advance Thin Films Laboratory, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang, Hebei 050024, China*

We explore two different geometric quantum discords defined respectively *via* the trace norm (GQD-1) and Hilbert-Schmidt norm (GQD-2) in multipartite systems. A rigorous hierarchy relation is revealed for the two GQDs in a class of symmetric two-qubit X-shape states. For multiqubit pure states, it is found that both GQDs are related to the entanglement concurrence, with the hierarchy relation being saturated. Furthermore, we look into a four-partite dynamical system consisting of two cavities interacting with independent reservoirs. It is found that the GQD-2 can exhibit various sudden change behaviours, while the GQD-1 only evolves asymptotically, with the two GQDs exhibiting different monogamous properties.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Yz

arXiv:1404.5799v2 [quant-ph] 2 Oct 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum correlation beyond entanglement is a typical characteristic of quantumness, which has attracted a lot of attention for the last decade [1–4]. While quantum discord [5, 6] is a kind of basic measure for bipartite quantum correlations, it is difficult to evaluate even for two-qubit states. Dakić *et al* introduced a geometric quantum discord *via* Hilbert-Schmidt norm (GQD-2), which is expressed as [7]

$$D_{g2}(\rho_{AB}) = 2\text{min}_{\chi\in\Omega_0}||\rho_{AB}-\chi_{AB}||_2^2, \tag{1}$$

where the minimum runs over all the set Ω_0 of zero-discord states $\chi_{AB}=\sum_i |i\rangle\langle i|_A\otimes\rho_B^i$, and the geometric distance is quantified by the square norm $||X-Y||_2^2=\text{Tr}(X-Y)^2$. The GQD-2 is effortlessly computable in many interesting cases [8–10], especially for two-qubit mixed states. Moreover, it is recently shown that this measure is related to the fidelity of remote state preparation [11–13].

Unfortunately, the GQD-2 may increase under local operations on the unmeasured party [14–16], which is different from that of quantum discord and thus is argued to be a drawback. To circumvent this problem, some other geometric discords may need to be introduced, such as the geometric quantum discord based on the trace norm (GQD-1) [17–20]

$$D_{g1}(\rho_{AB}) = \text{min}_{\chi\in\Omega_0}||\rho_{AB}-\chi_{AB}||_1, \tag{2}$$

where the trace norm is $||X||_1=\text{Tr}\sqrt{X^\dagger X}$. The GQD-1 has an operational interpretation that it is in correspondence with the one-shot state distinguishability between two states [21]. However, the computability of GQD-1 is weaker than that of GQD-2, and the analytical formula is available only for some specific classes of two-qubit states [18, 22–24].

For two-qubit Bell-diagonal states, it was identified both theoretically and experimentally that the GQD-1 can exhibit the freezing and sudden change behaviors under local noise environments [19, 20, 25–27]. In particular, in the dynamical procedures preserving Bell-diagonal form, the two GQDs obey the following relation [18]

$$D_{g1}^2[\rho^{BD}(t)] \geq D_{g2}[\rho^{BD}(t)]. \tag{3}$$

For the dynamical evolution beyond Bell-diagonal form, the relation between two GQDs may need a further investigation. In particular, for multipartite quantum systems, a profound understanding of the relation and difference between the two GQDs is still awaited.

In this paper, we first analyze a class of symmetric X-shape states beyond the Bell-diagonal form and show that there is a rigorous hierarchy relation between the two GQDs. For multiqubit pure states, we show that the hierarchy relation is saturated and both GQDs are related to the entanglement concurrence. Furthermore, we conduct a comparative investigation on the two GQDs for a four-partite dynamical system consisting of two cavities interacting with independent reservoirs. It is found that the GQD-2 can exhibit different sudden change behaviors, while, in contrast to the GQD-2, the GQD-1 only evolves asymptotically, and is not monogamous in both three- and four-qubit states. Finally, we discuss the monogamy property of the square of GQD-1 in multipartite systems.

II. THE HIERARCHY AND MONOGAMY PROPERTIES OF TWO GQDS.

According to the generalized Bloch representation, a two-qubit quantum state can be written as [28]

$$\rho=\frac{1}{4}(\text{I}\otimes\text{I}+\sum_{i=1}^{3}x_i\sigma_i\otimes\text{I}+\sum_{i=1}^{3}y_i\text{I}\otimes\sigma_i+\sum_{i,j=1}^{3}\Gamma_{ij}\sigma_i\otimes\sigma_j), \tag{4}$$

where $x_i=\text{Tr}\rho(\sigma_i\otimes\text{I})$, $y_i=\text{Tr}\rho(\text{I}\otimes\sigma_i)$ are components of local Bloch vectors with σ_i being the Pauli matrix, and Γ is the correlation matrix with element $\Gamma_{ij}=\text{Tr}\rho(\sigma_i\otimes\sigma_j)$. In this case, the GQD-2 has an analytical formula [7, 9]

$$D_{g2}(\rho_{AB})=\frac{1}{2}(k_1+k_2+k_3-k_{max}), \tag{5}$$

*Electronic address: ykbai@semi.ac.cn
†Electronic address: zwang@hku.hk

where k_is are the eigenvalues of matrix $K = \vec{x}\vec{x}^T + \Gamma\Gamma^T$ with k_{max} being the maximum.

So far, analytical results of GQD-1 have only been available for some specific classes of two-qubit states, where a typical class is the X-shape states in the form

$$\rho_{AB}^X = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{41}^* \\ 0 & \rho_{22} & \rho_{32}^* & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{32} & \rho_{33} & 0 \\ \rho_{41} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{44} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Ciccarello *et al* proved the analytical formula of GQD-1 [24]

$$D_{g1}(\rho_{AB}^X) = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_1^2\gamma_{max} - \gamma_2^2\gamma_{min}}{\gamma_{max} - \gamma_{min} + \gamma_1^2 - \gamma_2^2}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\gamma_1 = 2(\rho_{32} + \rho_{41})$, $\gamma_2 = 2(\rho_{32} - \rho_{41})$, and $\gamma_3 = 1-2(\rho_{22}+\rho_{33})$ being the singular values of correlation matrix Γ, and $\gamma_{min} = \min\{\gamma_3^2, \gamma_1^2\}$ and $\gamma_{max} = \max\{\gamma_3^2, \gamma_2^2 + x_3^2\}$ with x_3 being the z-component of local Bloch vector.

We consider a class of symmetric two-qubit X-shape state ρ_{AB}^{Xs}, for which matrix elements in Eq. (6) satisfy the conditions $\rho_{32} = 0$ or $\rho_{41} = 0$. For this class of quantum states, we have the following hierarchy relation.

Theorem 1. For symmetric X-shape states, two GQDs obey the following hierarchy relation

$$D_{g1}^2(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}) \geq D_{g2}(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}), \quad (8)$$

where $D_{g1} = |\gamma_1|$ and $D_{g2} = (\gamma_1^2 + \gamma'_{min})/2$ with $\gamma'_{min} = \min\{\gamma_1^2, \gamma_3^2 + x_3^2\}$, respectively.

Proof. For X-shape states, the matrix K of GQD-2 in Eq. (5) is diagonal and the eigenvalues have the form $k_1 = \gamma_1^2 = 4(\rho_{32}+\rho_{41})^2$, $k_2 = \gamma_2^2 = 4(\rho_{32}-\rho_{41})^2$, and $k_3 = \gamma_3^2 + x_3^2 = [1 - 2(\rho_{22} + \rho_{33})]^2 + [2(\rho_{11} + \rho_{22}) - 1]^2$. In the symmetric case of $\rho_{32} = 0$ or $\rho_{41} = 0$, we further have $k_1 = k_2 = \gamma_1^2$ which results in $D_{g2}(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}) = (\gamma_1^2 + \gamma'_{min})/2$. The GQD-1 in the symmetric X-shape states has the property $\gamma_1^2 = \gamma_2^2$, and the measure in Eq. (7) can be simplified to $D_{g1} = |\gamma_1|$ when the parameters $\gamma_{max} \neq \gamma_{min}$. For the two parameters γ_{max} and γ_{min}, there are three kinds of relations among the singular values and local Bloch vector: i) $\gamma_3^2 \geq \gamma_1^2$ and $\gamma_3^2 \geq \gamma_1^2 + x_3^2$, ii) $\gamma_3^2 \geq \gamma_1^2$ and $\gamma_3^2 \leq \gamma_1^2 + x_3^2$, iii) $\gamma_3^2 \leq \gamma_1^2$ and $\gamma_3^2 \leq \gamma_1^2 + x_3^2$, respectively. When $\gamma_{max} = \gamma_{min}$, we can obtain $|\gamma_1| = |\gamma_2| = |\gamma_3|$ for all the three kinds of relations, which corresponds to the homogeneous case and the GQD-1 has the form $D_{g1} = |\gamma_1|$ [24]. Therefore, for all symmetric X-shape states, the GQD-1 is formulated as a unified form $D_{g1}(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}) = |\gamma_1|$. Noting that the fact $\gamma_1^2 \geq \gamma'_{min}$, we have the hierarchy relation in Eq. (8) and complete the proof.

In the pure state case, quantum correlation is usually equivalent to quantum entanglement. Here, for N-qubit pure states, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. In an arbitrary N-qubit pure state $|\psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_n}\rangle$, the GQDs under partition $A_1|A_2\cdots A_n$ are related to the entanglement quantified by concurrence

$$D_{g1}(\psi_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}) = C_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}(\psi) = 2\sqrt{\lambda_0\lambda_1},$$
$$D_{g2}(\psi_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}) = C^2_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}(\psi) = 4\lambda_0\lambda_1, \quad (9)$$

where the hierarchy relation is saturated with λ_is being the eigenvalues of reduced density matrix ρ_{A_1}.

Proof. According to the Schmidt decomposition, an N-qubit pure state is equivalent to a logical two-qubit state under the partition $A_1|A_2\cdots A_n$. Up to local unitary transformations, the pure state has the form $|\psi_{A_1A_2\cdots A_n}\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_0}|0\rangle_{A_1}|0\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_n} + \sqrt{\lambda_1}|1\rangle_{A_1}|1\rangle_{A_2\cdots A_n}$, which belongs to the class of symmetric X-shape states. Therefore, the GQD-1 for the N-qubit pure state is $D_{g1}(\psi_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}) = |\gamma_1| = 2\sqrt{\lambda_0\lambda_1}$ in terms of theorem 1. On the other hand, the concurrence for the logical two-qubit state is $C_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}(\psi) = 2a_{00}a_{11} = 2\sqrt{\lambda_0\lambda_1}$ [29], leading to the first equation in the theorem. The GQD-2 for the pure state is $D_{g2}(\psi_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}) = 2(1 - \sum\lambda_i^2)$ [30]. Utilizing the relation $1 = (\lambda_0 + \lambda_1)^2 = 2\lambda_0\lambda_1 + \sum\lambda_i^2$, we have $D_{g2}(\psi_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}) = 4\lambda_0\lambda_1 = C^2_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}(\psi)$ which is just the second equation in the theorem, and then the proof is completed.

Recently, Hu and Fan present a measure of measurement-induced nonlocality based on trace norm (MIN-1) $N_1(\rho_{AB}) = \max_{\Pi^A}||\rho_{AB} - \Pi^A(\rho_{AB})||_1$ and the nonlocality in a $2 \otimes N$ pure state is $N_1(\psi) = 2\sqrt{\lambda_0\lambda_1}$ [31]. According to theorem 2, the GQD-1 is also equivalent to the MIN-1 in this case.

For mixed states, the GQDs are not equal to the entanglement in general, but the GQD-1 is still related to the concurrence in symmetric X-shape states.

Lemma 1. In the class of symmetric two-qubit X-shape states, the GQD-1 is not less than the concurrence, i.e.,

$$D_{g1}(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}) \geq C(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}). \quad (10)$$

Proof. For the symmetric X-shape states, the concurrence can be expressed as $C(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}) = \max\{0, |\gamma_1| - 2\eta\}$ in which $\eta = \sqrt{\rho_{22}\rho_{33}}$ when the matrix element $\rho_{32} = 0$ and $\eta = \sqrt{\rho_{11}\rho_{44}}$ when $\rho_{41} = 0$. According to theorem 1, we have $D_{g1}(\rho_{AB}^{Xs}) = |\gamma_1|$, from which we can obtain the lemma after a direct comparison to the concurrence.

In many-body quantum systems, one of the most important properties is that entanglement is monogamous [32], and, as is known, this property can be used for constructing multipartite entanglement measures [32–34]. For three-qubit pure states, the GQD-2 is monogamous [35], and this property is also satisfied by the square of quantum discord which results in a genuine three-qubit quantum correlation measure [36, 37]. In comparison to the GQD-2, the GQD-1 has a merit of contractility under local operations on the unmeasured party. Therefore, it is natural to ask whether the GQD-1 is monogamous in the case of several qubits. Unfortunately, it will be seen in the next section that the GQD-1 is not monogamous for the three-qubit pure states and mixed states as well as the four-qubit pure states.

III. THE DYNAMICAL PROPERTY OF TWO GQDS IN MULTIPARTITE CAVITY-RESERVOIR SYSTEMS.

Here we conduct a comparative study on GQD-1 and GQD-2 in a four-partite dynamical system consisting of two cavities



FIG. 1: (Color online) Dynamical evolution of GQD-2 as functions of the time evolution κt and the initial state parameter α: (a) $D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2})$, (b) $D_{g2}(\rho_{r_1r_2})$, (c) three types of correlation evolution classified by the sudden change lines of cavity photons (blue line) and reservoirs (red line).

interacting with independent reservoirs, where the interaction Hamiltonian of a single cavity-reservoir system is [38, 39]

$$\hat{H} = \hbar\omega\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + \hbar\sum_{k=1}^{N}\omega_k\hat{b}_k^\dagger\hat{b}_k + \hbar\sum_{k=1}^{N}g_k(\hat{a}\hat{b}_k^\dagger + \hat{b}_k\hat{a}^\dagger). \quad (11)$$

The initial state is $|\Phi_0\rangle = (\alpha|00\rangle + \beta|11\rangle)_{c_1c_2}|00\rangle_{r_1r_2}$ in which the dissipative reservoirs are in the vacuum state. In the limit of $N \to \infty$ for a reservoir with a flat spectrum, the output state of the multipartite system will be [38]

$$|\Psi_t\rangle = \alpha|0000\rangle_{c_1r_1c_2r_2} + \beta|\phi_t\rangle_{c_1r_1}|\phi_t\rangle_{c_2r_2}, \quad (12)$$

where $|\phi_t\rangle = \xi(t)|10\rangle + \chi(t)|01\rangle$ with the amplitudes being $\xi(t) = \exp(-\kappa t/2)$ and $\chi(t) = [1-\exp(-\kappa t)]^{1/2}$.

In the dynamical evolution, the density matrix of two cavity photons does not preserve the Bell-diagonal form ($x_3 \neq 0$) and has the form

$$\rho_{c_1c_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^2+\beta^2\chi^4 & 0 & 0 & \alpha\beta\xi^2 \\ 0 & \beta^2\xi^2\chi^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta^2\xi^2\chi^2 & 0 \\ \alpha\beta\xi^2 & 0 & 0 & \beta^2\xi^4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

which is just the *symmetric* X-shape state with element $\rho_{32} = 0$. We first consider the correlation evolution of GQD-2 in the subsystem. According to theorem 1, we have

$$D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2}) = [\gamma_1^2(\rho_{c_1c_2}) + \gamma'_{min}(\rho_{c_1c_2})]/2, \quad (14)$$

where the parameters are $\gamma_1^2 = 4\alpha^2\beta^2\xi^4$ and $\gamma'_{min} = \min\{\gamma_1^2, \gamma_3^2 + x_3^2\}$ with $\gamma_3^2 = (1-4\beta^2\xi^2\chi^2)^2$ and $x_3^2 = (1-2\beta^2\xi^2)^2$, respectively. For the subsystem of two reservoirs, its density matrix is similar to that in Eq. (13) and the



FIG. 2: (Color online) Asymptotical evolution of GQD-1 in different subsystems as functions of the time evolution κt and the initial state amplitude α: (a) $D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1c_2})$, (b) $D_{g1}(\rho_{r_1r_2})$, (c) $D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_1})$, (d) $D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_2})$.

relation $\rho_{r_1r_2} = S_{\xi\leftrightarrow\chi}[\rho_{c_1c_2}]$ is satisfied in which $S_{\xi\leftrightarrow\chi}$ is a transformation exchanging the parameters ξ and χ. Therefore, the GQD-2 of two reservoirs can be expressed as

$$D_{g2}(\rho_{r_1r_2}) = S_{\xi\leftrightarrow\chi}[D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2})]. \quad (15)$$

In Fig.1(a) and Fig.1(b), $D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2})$ and $D_{g2}(\rho_{r_1r_2})$ are plotted as functions of the time evolution κt and the initial state amplitude α, where we can see that the sudden change behavior exists. Due to the intrinsic relation in Eq. (15), when the GQD-2 of two cavity photons experiences the sudden change, the same behavior must happen in the reservoir systems, which is similar to the relation of entanglement sudden death and sudden birth in the subsystems [38, 40, 41].

For both cavity photons and reservoirs subsystems, the sudden change condition is

$$\gamma_1^2 = \gamma_3^2 + x_3^2, \quad (16)$$

and from which we plot the sudden change lines for $D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2})$ (blue line) and $D_{g2}(\rho_{r_1r_2})$ (red line) in Fig1.(c). As seen from the figure, there are three types of correlation evolution. In type *I* with $\alpha \in (0, 1/\sqrt{3})$, two D_{g2}s experience double sudden changes with a revival. The revival occurs at the time $\kappa t = \ln 2$ and the blue dashed line ab indicates the minimum of D_{g2}s in the overlap area marked out by the sudden change lines. In type *II* with $\alpha \in (1/\sqrt{3}, 0.7647)$, although the revival behavior disappears, the double sudden changes still exist except for the case $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$ exhibiting single sudden change behavior. In type *III* with $\alpha \geq 0.7647$, two quantum correlations evolve asymptotically, and the sudden change behavior disappears. Similarly, for the subsystems c_1r_1 and c_1r_2, we can also use the sudden change condition in Eq. (16) to determine the type of correlation evolution.

We now analyze two-qubit GQD-1 in multipartite cavity-reservoir systems, in which all the two-qubit states are in the



FIG. 3: (Color online) Monogamy analysis of GDD-1 and GQD-2 in multipartite cavity-reservoir systems, where $M_3(\Psi)$ (blue solid line), $M_3(\rho)$ (purple solid line), $M_4(\Psi)$ (red solid line), and $M_3'(\rho)$ (purple dash-dotted line) are not monogamous but $M_3'(\Psi)$ (blue dash-dotted line) and $M_4'(\Psi)$ (red dash-dotted line) are monogamous.

symmetric X-shape form. Based on theorem 1, the correlation equates to the first singular value $|\gamma_1|$ and we have

$$D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1c_2}) = 2\alpha\beta\xi^2, D_{g1}(\rho_{r_1r_2}) = 2\alpha\beta\chi^2,$$
$$D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_1}) = 2\beta^2\xi\chi, D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_2}) = 2\alpha\beta\xi\chi, \quad (17)$$

respectively. In Fig.2, the four D_{g1}s are plotted as functions of parameters κt and α, where all the quantum correlations evolve asymptotically. Via the hierarchy relation in theorem 1, the GQD-1 is related to the GQD-2. For example, $D_{g1}^2(\rho_{c_1c_2}) = D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2})$ when the sudden change of $D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2})$ does not occur, and when the sudden change appears the relation is strictly $D_{g1}^2(\rho_{c_1c_2}) > D_{g2}(\rho_{c_1c_2})$ in the sudden change area. The case for other subsystems is similar.

The GQD-2 was indicated to be monogamous in three-qubit pure states [35]. Whether the GQD-1 is still monogamous in these states? To answer this question, we turn to analyze the monogamy property of the two GQDs in multipartite cavity-reservoir systems.

In the output state of Eq. (12), subsystem c_2r_2 can be regarded as a logic qubit, and then the reduced state $\rho_{c1(c2r2)}$ is equivalent to a two-qubit state which is in the symmetric X-shape form and its GQD-1 is $D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1(c_2r_2)}) = 2\alpha\beta\xi$. In multipartite cavity-reservoir systems, the monogamy property of three-qubit pure states can be checked via the quantity $M_3(|\Psi_t\rangle) = D_{g1}(|\Psi\rangle_{c_1|r_1(c_2r_2)}) - D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_1}) - D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1|(c_2r_2)})$ in which the multiqubit GQD-1 can be calculated by theorem 2. Similarly, for the cases of three-qubit mixed states and four-qubit pure states, we can utilize $M_3(\rho_t) = D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1(c_2r_2)}) - D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1c_2}) - D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_2})$ and $M_4(|\Psi_t\rangle) = D_{g1}(|\Psi\rangle_{c_1|r_1c_2r_2}) - D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_1}) - D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1c_2}) - D_{g1}(\rho_{c_1r_2})$, respectively. In the same way, we can define the quantities $M_3'(|\Psi_t\rangle)$, $M_3'(\rho_t)$, and $M_4'(|\Psi_t\rangle)$ with the corresponding D_{g2}s. In Fig.3, these monogamy quantities are plotted as functions of the time evolution κt, where the initial state amplitude is chosen to be $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{2}$. The function $M_3'(|\Psi_t\rangle)$ (blue dash-dotted line) is always nonnegative, which coincides with the fact that the GQD-2 is monogamous in three-qubit pure states [35]. In three-qubit mixed states, $M_3'(\rho_t)$ can be positive or negative (purple dash-dotted line), and then it is not monogamous. In four-qubit pure states, although $M_4'(|\Psi_t\rangle)$ (red dash-dotted line) is monogamous, but the property in general case cannot be guaranteed. For the GQD-1 in multipartite cavity-reservoir systems, we find all the functions $M_3(|\Psi_t\rangle)$ (blue solid line), $M_3(\rho_t)$ (purple solid line), and $M_4(|\Psi_t\rangle)$ (red solid line) are negative, which indicates the GQD-1 is not monogamous.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.

Although the GQD-1 itself is not monogamous in the cavity-reservoir system, it is noted that the square of GQD-1 may be monogamous in this multipartite system. After some derivations, we can obtain $M_3^{(2)}(|\Psi_t\rangle) = D_{g1}^2(|\Psi\rangle_{c_1|r_1(c_2r_2)}) - D_{g1}^2(\rho_{c_1r_1}) - D_{g1}^2(\rho_{c_1|(c_2r_2)}) = 0$ for all the values of parameters κt and α. In addition, quantified by the square of GQD-1, we can get $M_3^{(2)}(\rho_t) = 0$ and $M_4^{(2)}(|\Psi_t\rangle) = 0$ as well. Moreover, it is also interesting to look into the monogamy property in a nontrivial N-qubit case [42], i.e., a generalized W state

$$|W_N\rangle = a_1|10\cdots0\rangle + a_2|01\cdots0\rangle + \cdots + a_n|00\cdots1\rangle. \quad (18)$$

Its two-qubit reduced density matrix ρ_{1j} is in the symmetric X-shape. According to lemma 1, it is known that the GQD-1 is not less than the concurrence, and thus $D_{g1}(\rho_{1j}) = C(\rho_{1j}) = 2a_1a_j$ in this case. Combining this property with theorem 2, we obtain $M_N^{(2)}(|W\rangle) = C^2(|W\rangle_{A_1|A_2\cdots A_n}) - \sum_{j\neq1} C^2(\rho_{A_1A_j}) = 0$, which implies that the square of GQD-1 is monogamous [43]. It is worthwhile pointing out that the monogamy property of the square of GQD-1 even in a general three-qubit (or four-qubit pure) state is still an open problem mainly due to the hardness of computing the GQD-1.

In conclusion, we have made a comparative study on two GQDs in multipartite systems. In symmetric X-shape states, there exists a hierarchy relation between the GQDs, and the GQD-1 has a simple expression without maximization and minimization. Moreover, for multiqubit pure states, the hierarchy relation is saturated and the GQDs are related to the entanglement concurrence. Furthermore, we have analyzed the dynamical property of two GQDs in multipartite cavity-reservoir systems, and found that (i) the GQD-2 can exhibit various sudden change behaviors while the GQD-1 only evolves asymptotically; and (ii) in contrast to the GQD-2 being monogamous in three-qubit pure states, the GQD-1 is not monogamous in both three- and four-qubit states.

Acknowledgments. – This work was supported by the RGC of Hong Kong under Grant No. HKU7058/11P. Y.K.B. and T.T.Z. were also supported by NSF-China (under Grant No. 10905016) and Hebei NSF (under Grant No. A2012205062).

[1] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012).

[2] V. Madhok and A. Datta, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1245041 (2013).

[3] R. Lo Franco, B. Bellomo, S. Maniscalco, and G. Compagno, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345053 (2013).

[4] J.-S. Xu, K. Sun, C.-F. Li, X.-Y. Xu, G.-C. Guo, E. Andersson, R. Lo Franco and G. Compagno, Nature Commun. **4**, 2851 (2013).

[5] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001).

[6] L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001).

[7] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010).

[8] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).

[9] D. Girolami and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 150403 (2012).

[10] S. Rana and P. Parashar, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 024102 (2012).

[11] B. Dakić, Y. O. Lipp, X. Ma, M. Ringbauer, S. Kropatschek, S. Barz, T. Paterek, V. Vedral, A. Zeilinger, Č. Brukner, and P. Walther, Nature Phys. **8**, 666 (2012).

[12] G. L. Giorgi, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 022315 (2013).

[13] P. Horodecki, J. Tuziemski, P. Mazurek, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 140507 (2014).

[14] X. Hu, H. Fan, D. L. Zhou, and W.-M. Liu, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 032340 (2013).

[15] T. Tufarelli, D. Girolami, R. Vasile, S. Bose, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 052326 (2012).

[16] M. Piani, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 034101 (2012).

[17] T. Debarba, T. O. Maciel, and R. O. Vianna, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 024302 (2012).

[18] F. M. Paula, T. R. de Oliveira, and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 064101 (2013).

[19] B. Aaronson, R. Lo Franco, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 012120 (2013).

[20] B. Aaronson, R. Lo Franco, G. Compagno, and G. Adesso, New J. Phys. **15**, 093022 (2013).

[21] A. Gilchrist, N. K. Langford, and M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062310 (2005).

[22] F. M. Paula, J. D. Montealegre, A. Saguia, T. R. de Oliveira, and M. S. Sarandy, Europhys. Lett. **103**, 50008 (2013).

[23] T. Nakano, M. Piani, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 012117 (2013).

[24] F. Ciccarello, T. Tufarelli, and V. Giovannetti, New J. Phys. **16**, 013038 (2014).

[25] J. D. Montealegre, F. M. Paula, A. Saguia, and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042115 (2013).

[26] I. A. Silva, D. Girolami, R. Auccaise, R. S. Sarthour, I. S. Oliveira, T. J. Bonagamba, E. R. deAzevedo, D. O. Soares-Pinto, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 140501 (2013).

[27] F. M. Paula, I. A. Silva, J. D. Montealegre, A. M. Souza, E. R. deAzevedo, R. S. Sarthour, A. Saguia, I. S. Oliveira, D. O. Soares-Pinto, G. Adesso, and M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 250401 (2013).

[28] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).

[29] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).

[30] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 120401 (2011).

[31] M.-L. Hu and H. Fan, arXiv:1402.4321v1.

[32] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A. **61**, 052306 (2000).

[33] Y.-K. Bai, D. Yang, and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 022336 (2007).

[34] Y.-K. Bai and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032313 (2008)

[35] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, M. Piani, and D. Bruß, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 050503 (2012).

[36] Y.-K. Bai, N. Zhang, M.-Y. Ye, and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 012123 (2013).

[37] Y.-K. Bai, Y.-F. Xu, and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 100503 (2014).

[38] C. E. López, G. Romero, F. Lastra, E. Solano, and J. C. Retamal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 080503 (2008).

[39] B. Bellomo, G. Compagno, R. Lo Franco, A. Ridolfo, S. Savasta, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **9**, 1665 (2011).

[40] Y.-K. Bai, M.-Y. Ye, and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 044301 (2009).

[41] W. Wen, Y.-K. Bai, and H. Fan, Eur. Phys. J. D **64**, 557 (2011).

[42] For the trivial case of generalized N-qubit GHZ state $|G_N\rangle = a|00\cdots0\rangle + b|11\cdots1\rangle$, since all its two-qubit reduced states are classical states, the monogamy score of the square of GQD-1 is just $D^2_{g1}(A_1|A_2\cdots A_n)$ indicating the monogamy property. The case for GQD-2 is similar.

[43] According to the hierachy relation $D^2_{g1}(\rho^{Xs}_{A_1A_j}) \geq D_{g2}(\rho^{Xs}_{A_1A_j})$ in theorem 1, we can further obtain that the GQD-2 is also monogamous in the generalized N-qubit W state.